APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,227	02/13/2001	Scott Craig Koss	8371-123	2514

46404	7590	09/08/2005	

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER
SORRELL, ERON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2182	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/784,227	KOSS, SCOTT CRAIG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eron J. Sorrell	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114,

including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this

application after final rejection.   Since this application is

eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the

finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.   Applicant's submission filed on

7/13/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs

of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under

this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published
> under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the
> invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an
> application for patent by another filed in the United States before the
> invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international
> application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the
> effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the
> United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English
> language.

3.   Claims 1,2,5,8,9,10,12,13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 6,587,217 hereinafter Lahey).

4.   Referring to method claim 1 and computer-readable medium claim 9, Lahey teaches a method for network document processing, the method comprising:

a) activating an interface between a predetermined document processing device and a workstation by locating the predetermined document processing device and accessing the operational settings of the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7 and lines 35-47 of column 8, wherein Lahey teaches selecting a specific printer and designate printing attributes);

b) providing at least one user interface to a user at the workstation, wherein the interface allows the user to select the operational setting for the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

c) generating a document data file (see lines 15-31 of column 7); and

d) communicating a location of the document data file and any auxiliary information to the predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by the user (see lines 22-27 of column 6).

5.   Referring to claim 2, Lahey teaches activating an interface

further comprises launching a document processing client in

response to a document processing request by the user (see lines

15-31 of column 7).

6.   Referring to claim 5, Lahey teaches generating a document

data file further comprises storing the document data file on a

job file store (see lines 30-37 of column 12).

7.   Referring to method claim 8 and system claim 17, Lahey

teaches the document processing device is one of the group

comprising: a printer, a fax machine, a multi-function

peripheral, an electronic document management system, a plotter,

a network fax machine, a language translation server and a

knowledge management system (see item labeled 31 in figure 1 and

paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

8.   Referring to claim 10, Lahey discloses an software

application for print processing (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

This program is fully capable of being downloaded.

9.   Referring to claim 12, Lahey teaches a network document

processing system, comprising:

a) a generic document processing client installed on at least one workstation connected to a network, wherein the document processing client is operable to interact with several different types of document processing devices (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

b) a job file store, operable to receive document data files generated by the document processing client (see lines 31-37 of column 12); and

c) at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of the document data files and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client (see lines 7-18 of column 5).

10.   Referring to claim 13, Lahey teaches the document-processing client is one of the group comprised of: a printer client, a fax client, an electronic document management system client, a language translation client, and a knowledge system management client (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

11.   Referring to claims 15 and 16, Lahey discloses the job file is located on another device in the network and the job file store is a dedicated device (see lines 31-37 of column 12).

12. Referring to claims 18 and 19, Lahey discloses generating

the document comprises generating a document data file based on

the operational settings (see lines 14-17 of column 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which

forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3,4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent

No. 6,166,826).

15. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Lahey fails to teach

activating an interface further comprises launching and

retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the

predetermined document processing device.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, activating an

interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages

to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing

device, wherein the user interface is a web page (see lines 29-37 of column 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to access the desired information with any computer with access to the internet.

16.   Referring to claim 7, Lahey teaches the auxiliary information includes the operational settings specified by the user (see lines 25-27 of column 6), however Lahey fails to explicitly set forth the limitation that the auxiliary information includes the size of the file.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, the auxiliary information including the size of the file (see lines 20-25 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to select files to be

printed based on the files attribute information as suggested by

Yokoyama (see lines 26-37 of column 3).

17.   Claims 6,11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No.

6,552,816).

18.   Referring to claim 6, Lahey fails to teach communicating a

location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to

the predetermined document-processing device.

Shima teaches, in an analogous system, communicating a

location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to

the predetermined document-processing device (see lines 19-40 of

column 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the

system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

make such modification in order for the printer to be able to

print documents from any computer with access to the internet.

19.   Referring to clam 11, Lahey fails to teach the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network.

Shima teaches the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the computer-readable medium of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima in order for to allow for each computer on the network to print to the network printer.

20.   Referring to claim 14, Lahey fails to teach the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client.

Shima teaches the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in

order for documents on the workstations hard disk can be
printed.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/05 have been fully
considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

1) The prior art of record fails to teach the newly added
limitations of activating an interface between a workstation and
a document processing device by locating the predetermined
document processing device and accessing an operation setting of
the predetermined document processing device as required by
claim 1 (see second full paragraph of page 7 of applicants
remarks, similar arguments are reiterated at the second full
paragraph of page 11, and the third full paragraph of page 12).

2) The prior art does not teach a document processing client…
operable to interact with **several** different types of document
processing devices (emphasis in applicant's reply).

As per argument 1, the Examiner disagrees. Lahey teaches
locating a predetermined document processing device (see lines
35-47 of column 8). Lahey teaches the activated a drop down
menu, can locate a desired printer from that list and select it,

then select the operational settings such as selecting the page

layout, alignment, single-sided/double sided etc.

As per argument 2, the Examiner disagrees. Lahey teaches the

document processing client is operable to interact with several

different types of devices (see at least figure 5a wherein Lahey

illustrates several different types of printers). The document

processing client interacts, via the server, with each of the

devices by being able to select different operation settings

(listed supra) for printing. There is no limitation in the

claim requiring a direct connection between the workstation

running the client and the document processing devices.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J.

Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are

unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be

reached on 571-272-4083. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is
571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be
obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval
(PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status
information for unpublished applications is available through
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,
see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on
access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EJS
August 31, 2005

KIM HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/1/05